

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 and 10-16 are pending. Claim 9 has been canceled. No new matter is presented.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview on November 7, 2005. During the interview, the Examiner explained that he is interpreting the limitation of “printer language data” as any data which can be read by a printer. Thus, the Examiner considers that the compressed raster data of Onodera corresponds to the claimed printer language data.

Claim 9 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c). Claim 9 has been canceled, rendering this objection moot.

Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Onodera, U.S. Patent No. 6,181,435. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 recites that the first image data (which is in a printer language) is developed into second image data (which is bitmap data) and then the second image data (bitmap data) is printed. The time it takes to develop the printer language data into the bitmap data is compared to the time it takes to print the bitmap data, and if the former time is less than the latter time, the printer language data is stored.

The term “printer language data” is a term that is well known in the art and is synonymous with the term “page description language” as used by Onodera. For example, see U.S. Patent No. 5,165,014 (at col. 1, lines 31-36), where this patent teaches that the printer language of Printer Command Language (PCL) is well known in the art and was developed by Hewlett Packard Company to define a standard for printer features and feature access by software applications. U.S. Patent No. 5,500,928 (at col. 4, lines 33-36), teaches that high level commands are the graphic commands of a page description language such as the PCL (of Hewlett Packard) or the POSTSCRIPT page description language (of Adobe System, Inc).

Thus, it is evident that the printer language data of claim 8 and the page description language of Onodera are the same. As seen in Fig. 3 of Onodera, the image data is received in the page description language in step S301. The image data is then converted to coded band data in step S302, and then later rasterized in step S305. Onodera discloses comparing the time required for developing compressed bitmap data in step S307, but this could not possibly correspond to the time required for developing the printer language data because the data is no longer in the printer language (or page description language) format. The Examiner is comparing two steps which do not relate to image data in the same format. The claimed step compares the data in the printer language format and Onodera compares the data in the rasterized coded band data format. Thus, Onodera fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 8.

Claims 10 and 13 recite substantially the same features as recited in claim 8, and are allowable for the same reasons. Claims 11 and 12 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772014000.

Dated: November 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7753